Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/572,199	SCHOEN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	DAVID R. CROWE	2885
All Participants:	: Status of Application: <u>RCE filed</u>	
(1) <u>DAVID R. CROWE</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>John LaBatt (48,301)</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>17 June 2010</u>	Time: <u>3 <i>PM</i></u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: n/a		
Claims discussed: independents		
Prior art documents discussed: n/a		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: The examiner contacted the applicant's representative to suggest the claim amendments currently presented in the attached examiner's amendment. The changes were proposed to clarify the geometry being claimed with respect to the visibility of light emitted from the device. "Each of" was removed from the claim because light from the units collectively can be seen, but the optical interfaces would prevent light from a single light unit being seen at a side opposite the optical interface. "Any azimuth direction" was suggested to read "every azimuth direction" to clarify that light is filling a three dimensional space defined by the spherical coordinates and not simply visible from a single predetermined point. The applicant's representative conferred with the applicant and accepted the proposed changes.		
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summa 	ne examiner will provide a writt record of the substance of the	e interview, since the interview
(Applicant/Applicant's Representa	tive Signature – if appropriate)